

## REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 29-70 were pending. Claims 29-70 were rejected. In this response, no claim has been amended or canceled. Thus, claims 29-70 remain pending. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 29-31, 33-46, 48-61 and 63-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,793,365 of Tang ("Tang") in view of U.S. Patent 5,668,863 of Bieselin ("Bieselin"). Claims 32, 47 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Tang, in view of Bieselin, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,956,038 of Rekimoto ("Rekimoto").

It is respectfully submitted that claims 29-70 include limitations that are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, individually or in combination. Specifically, independent claim 29 recites as follows:

29. A method for coordinating a plurality of communications in a plurality of media in an information processing system, comprising:  
communicating between a user node and each of a plurality of media servers directly and not through other of said media servers, wherein each of the media servers communicates in a different one of the plurality of the media; and  
in response to control communications between one of the media servers and the user node, the one media server controlling the communicating between the user node and the plurality of the media servers to coordinate presentation of communications in the plurality of the media at the user node.

(Emphasis added)

Independent claim 29 includes multiple media servers, where in response to control communications between a user node and one of the media servers, the targeted media server coordinates presentation of communications in the plurality of media of the rest of the media

servers at the user node. It is respectfully submitted that the above limitations are absent from the cited references, individually or in combination.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Tang fails to teach a media server controlling the communication between the user node and the media servers. However, the Examiner maintains that Bieselin teaches such limitations. Specifically, the Examiner stated:

“However, Bieselin teaches recording/retrieval of audio conferences, whereby an audio conferencing system server comprises a system controller and a data storage subsystem, said storage subsystem primarily storing audio data (see Bieselin Figure 1 item 100, 110, 125, also column 3, lines 60-67). Since item 100 contains both the controller, data storage, etc., item 100 controls communications between a user and audio data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Bieselin Figure 1 item 100, to Tang’s media servers as indicated in Tang Figure 11, providing Tang the benefit of integrating communication along with a particular media server so as to free up communication resources elsewhere (comparing with claim 29 “in response to control communications between one of the media server... in the plurality of the media at the user node.”).”

(12/24/2003 Office Action, page 3, emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Although item 100 of Bieselin includes a system controller 110, as acknowledged by the Examiner, system controller 110 of Bieselin controls communications between a user and the audio data stored in the audio conferencing server of Figure 1 (e.g., the same server of item 100). However, system controller of Bieselin does not communicate with another media server (over a network), particularly, to coordinate the presentation of the content between a user node and other media servers. Thus, the system controller of Bieselin is not capable of controlling the communicating between a user node and multiple media servers to coordinate presentation of communications in the multiple media at the user node, as recited in claim 29 of the present application. The audio-conferencing server’s functions of Bieselin are to record the conference that the users are participating in. Specifically, Bieselin states:

“Controller 110 is a processor that is configured to communicate control signals to audio conferencing subsystem 105, for example, to identify the line cards coupled to phone sets of conference participants. Furthermore, in accordance with the teachings of the present invention, the controller 110 receives the voice signals generated by conference participants during the teleconference and records voice data representative of the voice signals, as well as other information, in the data storage subsystem 125.”

(Bieselin, col. 3, lines 56 to 64)

Thus, the server of Bieselin does not control the communications between the users and other servers. It appears that Bieselin is consistent with Tang, where each individual server does not coordinate with other servers to present the content to a user. Rather, as suggested by Tang, an additional server (e.g., communication server 80 of Tang) is required, which incurs an additional cost and infrastructures, and teaches away from the present invention as claimed.

In contrast, independent claim 29 includes one media server controlling the communicating between the user node and the plurality of the media servers (e.g., other media servers) to coordinate presentation of communications in the plurality of the media at the user node, which is completely absent from Tang and Bieselin, individually or in combination.

Further, there is no suggestion within the cited references to combine Tang with Bieselin. Even if they were combined, such a combination still lacks the limitations set forth above. Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 29 is patentable over Tang and Bieselin.

Similarly, independent claims 44 and 59 include the limitations similar to those recited in claim 29. Thus, for the reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 44 and 59 are patentable over the cited references.

Given that claims 30-43, 45-58, and 60-70 depend from one of the above independent claims, for at least the reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 30-43, 45-58, and 60-70 are also patentable over the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 2/19/2004

  
Kevin G. Shao  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 45,095

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300